Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/622,952	COLUCCI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

JOS	SEPH SCHELL	2114	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addr	ess
THE REPLY FILED <u>20 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICA	TION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the sapplication, applicant must timely file one of the following replie application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (w for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1 periods:	ame day as filing a Notice of As: (1) an amendment, affidavitith appeal fee) in compliance w	appeal. To avoid aban , or other evidence, wl with 37 CFR 41.31; or	nich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisor no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). Of MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	y Action, or (2) the date set forth in an SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	١.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on wh have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensio under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorter set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	n and the corresponding amount oned statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final Office	te extension fee action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within tAMENDMENTS 	thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but pr (a) They raise new issues that would require further conside (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better fo appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corres	ration and/or search (see NOT	E below); ucing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. So 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable non-allowable claim(s).	<u>_</u> .		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) whow the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 17-21 . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	planation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and suffiwas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	cient reasons why the affidavit	or other evidence is r	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Not entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overco showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and	me <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	to provide a
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but doe. 		•	
the arguments are unpersuasive. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO.	, , , , , ,	condition for allowant	e because.
13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
/Scott T Baderman/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2114			

Continuation of 13. Other: the current status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li ('708) in view of '678': The 666 of DSL Users and Hammond ('785).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li ('708) in view of '678': The 666 of DSL Users, Hammond ('785) and Habib ('365).